

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

**JAMES ASHFORD, et al.
Plaintiffs,**

v.

Case No. 13-C-0771

**CITY OF MILWAUKEE, et al.,
Defendants.**

DECISION AND ORDER

As described in more detail in other orders issued today, the plaintiffs have filed a complaint alleging violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against individual police officers, their supervisors, and the City of Milwaukee. In this order, I address the defendants' motion for a more definite statement. Such motions are disfavored, see 2 James Wm. Moore, Moore's Federal Practice—Civil § 12.36[1] (3d ed. 2013), and should be granted only when a pleading "is so vague or ambiguous that the party cannot reasonably prepare a response," Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e). The plaintiffs' complaint is not so vague or ambiguous. Rather, it is well organized and separated into counts that clearly identify the alleged wrongdoing of each defendant and the relief sought. The details that the defendants seek—including precise dates and times of certain events and the names of individuals—can be obtained during discovery. Although the defendants may prefer to have those details before they file their responsive pleadings, the information contained in the complaint is enough to enable them to reasonably prepare their responses.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the defendants' motion for a more definite statement is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 2nd day of January 2014.

s/ Lynn Adelman

LYNN ADELMAN
District Judge